

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: McGartland, Al[McGartland.Al@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
From: Roberts, Martha
Sent: Mon 7/6/2015 1:09:44 PM
Subject: RE: SCC

Hm. Thanks for checking back in on this. Unfortunately I don't know. Let me check in with OCIR on status/who you all should connect with.

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 8:51 AM
To: Roberts, Martha
Cc: McGartland, Al; Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: FW: SCC

Hi Martha,

Ex 5

Let me know when you can, or let me know who I should reach out to in OCIR to inquire about this if that is easier. I can easily send something along within the next few hours if need be.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2015 1:55 PM
To: Barron, Alex; Marten, Alex
Cc: McGartland, Al; Roberts, Martha

Subject: RE: SCC

Hi Alex,

I am working on the SCC materials, but given that I will still have to run it by Kate, and you will likely want to shorten/tweak too (we have so many Q&A at this point it's hard to know how many to include), it's unlikely that a final version will be ready for her book by COB today.

Any chance you can you get us a little extension?

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Wolverton, Ann
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 9:33 AM
To: Barron, Alex; Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Cc: McGartland, Al; Roberts, Martha
Subject: RE: SCC

Hi Alex,


Attached are some bullets on the economy wide SAB process. They are consistent with what we say in the desk statement. Let me know if you need anything else.

Ann

From: Barron, Alex

Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 11:03 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Cc: Wolverson, Ann; McGartland, Al; Roberts, Martha
Subject: FW: SCC

The Administrator is testifying before HST on “regulatory efforts” on 7/9 but OCIR would like some materials for her book by COB this Thursday.



Ex 5

Al/Martha – Please chime in if you can think of other topics likely to come up.

Alex

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wed 6/17/2015 7:33:01 PM
Subject: most recent hearing prep file
2015 HEC hearing (03 30 15).docx

attached

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Sarofim, Marcus
Sent: Tue 6/16/2015 9:45:41 PM
Subject: RE: OAR website

CSIB branch policy is to the extent possible to get open access for all the papers we author,

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
WJC East 4410M
Environmental Scientist
Climate Science & Impacts Branch

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 4:38 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: RE: OAR website

This was not an NCEE working paper, but I will look into our options.

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 4:25 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: RE: OAR website

+Marcus (see note below about open access and posting papers like CH4-O3 on the EPA website).

Ex 5

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 4:11 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: OAR website

Ex 5

--

Alex L. Marten
phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 4:09 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Subject: OAR website

Thanks and no problem on the memo, you're not slowing me down on anything.

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks,
Kate

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 3:49 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: footnote for HD2

I think this looks good, and I am fine with the first placement for the first footnote. I also forwarded this to our management. Not sure when they will look at it but will let you know if they have any comments.

Sorry I haven't gotten you comments on the memo yet. I have to leave soon but promise to finish it first thing in the morning.

Thanks,
Elizabeth

From: Shouse, Kate

Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 2:18 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Subject: footnote for HD2

Ex 5

Thanks,
Kate

To: Moore, Chris[Moore.Chris@epa.gov]; Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Thundiyil, Karen
Sent: Fri 6/12/2015 2:42:13 PM
Subject: FW: Revised Landfills Emission Guidelines Pkg - OP Comments
[EO 12866 Landfills EG 2060 AS23 NPRM 20150611.docx](#)
[EO 12866 Landfills EG 2060 AS23 NPRM 20150611_tracked.docx](#)

Latest version of Landfills EG

From: Rush, Alan
Sent: Friday, June 12, 2015 10:40 AM
To: Adams, Darryl
Cc: Morgan, Ruthw; Henigin, Mary; Thundiyil, Karen
Subject: FW: Revised Landfills Emission Guidelines Pkg - OP Comments

Darryl,

Attached is the revised version of the Landfills EG. Do you need a paper copy or two? I attached the RLSO for Karen's benefit.

Alan

From: Eck, Janet
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2015 12:46 PM
To: Rush, Alan
Cc: Marsh, Karen; Ward, Hillary; Cozzie, David; Fruh, Steve; Thompson, Fred
Subject: Revised Landfills Emission Guidelines Pkg - OP Comments

Hi Alan, Attached is an updated version of the Emission Guidelines for MSW Landfills (SAN 4846.1) that addresses comments received from Karen Thundiyil and Elizabeth Kopits in OP. Also attached is a redline/strikeout version that highlights comments received and changes made. Please forward through OAR and back to OP for review. Thanks.

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tue 5/26/2015 3:42:41 PM
Subject: Re: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

Great, thanks!

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 11:20 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

Thanks, Kate. I just talked to Cay too and she said she would send us both the latest version. I am happy to take a stab at it and send to you.

As for Alex B, in our conversation this morning he sounded like this was decided.

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 11:18 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: Re: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

Thanks! Just talked to Cay and sounds like she is going to send us the latest version.

Ex 5

Ex 5 He has meetings most of the morning so may not be able to review until the afternoon.

Ex 5

Thanks,
Kate

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 9:25 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Subject: FW: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

From: Klemick, Heather
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 9:19 AM
To: Helfand, Gloria
Cc: Nagelhout, Peter; Wolverton, Ann; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

Hi Gloria (and Peter, you might have these too),

Ex 5

Thanks!

Heather

To: Klemick, Heather[Klemick.Heather@epa.gov]
Cc: Nagelhout, Peter[Nagelhout.Peter@epa.gov]; Wolverton, Ann[Wolverton.Ann@epa.gov];
Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Yanca, Catherine[yanca.catherine@epa.gov]
From: Helfand, Gloria
Sent: Tue 5/26/2015 1:24:58 PM
Subject: RE: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

I've forwarded your message to Cay Yanca, who knows more about the document status than I do.

Gloria Helfand, Ph.D.

Assessment and Standards Division

Office of Transportation and Air Quality

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

2000 Traverwood Drive

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

(734) 214-4688

From: Klemick, Heather
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 9:19 AM
To: Helfand, Gloria
Cc: Nagelhout, Peter; Wolverton, Ann; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: latest version of HD preamble/RIA

Hi Gloria (and Peter, you might have these too),

Ex 5

Thanks!

Heather

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tue 5/19/2015 6:47:11 PM
Subject: FW: comments on the OW Steam Electric Effluent Guidelines package
[OW effluent guidelines Benefit and Cost Analysis FAR ks.docx](#)
[OW effluent guidelines preamble FAR ks.docx](#)

FYI

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 2:46 PM
To: Lamson, Amy
Cc: Allen (fawcett.allen@epa.gov); Gunning, Paul; Krieger, Jackie; Kristina Friedman; Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: comments on the OW Steam Electric Effluent Guidelines package

Hi, Amy. I reviewed the SCC discussions in the preamble and RIA and provided several substantive comments (attached). My comments address problems in the use and presentation of SCC (

Ex 5

Ex 5

For your background, OP has not yet sent comments to OW on the SCC section but they will be sending updated SCC content to OW once it's ready. The comments I've attached will still be relevant.

Thanks for bringing this to our attention. Please let me know if you'd like to discuss further,
Kate

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Kok, Nancy[Kok.Nancy@epa.gov]; Snyder, Brett[Snyder.Brett@epa.gov]
Cc: Clayton, Margie[Clayton.Margie@epa.gov]; Harvey, Alecia[Harvey.Alecia@epa.gov]; Palmer, Jamie[Palmer.Jamie@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tue 5/19/2015 2:23:52 PM
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Ex 5

-----Original Message-----

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 10:22 AM
To: Shouse, Kate; Kok, Nancy; Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Palmer, Jamie
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Kate.

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks,
Elizabeth

-----Original Message-----

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 8:31 AM
To: Kok, Nancy; Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kopits, Elizabeth; Palmer, Jamie
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Nancy. You are correct that it should have gone to the approvers first. Worked with our FCO this morning and sent it to the approvers for their review.

Thanks again,
Kate

-----Original Message-----

From: Kok, Nancy
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:39 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kopits, Elizabeth; Palmer, Jamie
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate,

I see your CN in IGMS. It looks like it needs to be sent to your approvers first (Pamela Bullard and Margie Clayton) and then sent to your FCO (Jamie). Pamela and Margie have not approved it yet. Also in our office, we usually enter some information in the Fiscal Information table, e.g., FY, Approp Code, BO Code, etc., before we send it to our FCO. But your office may have a different business process.

Thanks,
Nancy Kok
Office of Policy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, 1805T

Washington, DC 20460
(202) 564-6064 (ph)
(202) 566-3001 (fax)
Kok.Nancy@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:15 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy; Kopits, Elizabeth; Palmer, Jamie
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Brett, that sounds like a good plan. I just sent the CN forward on my side so hopefully that will come through soon. I've listed you and Nancy as readers.

Jamie, I think it should go to you first in IGMS but please let me know if you don't receive it.

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:03 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate -

Ex 5

Thanks,

Brett
566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:13 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi, Brett.

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks for sharing this information, it is immensely helpful.

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 9:50 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate:

Sounds like a plan.

Attaching working draft if the Statement of Work, should you want to include it anything it contains in communication with your management concerning project and Commitment Notice.

Here is some additional information we prepared in our Commitment Notice

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks again, and let us know if you have any questions.

Brett Snyder
USEPA, NCEE
202-566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 8:56 AM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Brett, for the helpful and prompt response. OAP can create the commitment notice in IGMS, route it, and finalize so that Leon can add the funds. I am going to meet with Margie on Monday morning so that we can sort through some OAP-specific details. In the meantime, if you are able to send a screen shot, that would be really helpful. Will circle back with you once we've created the commitment notice.

Thanks again,
Kate

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:38 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate and Margie:

Thank you for your notes and for helping us out with the IA with DOE to access their NRC contract.

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks again, and if it helps to chat about anything as well, happy to do so.

Brett Snyder
USEPA, NCEE
202-566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:01 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie
Subject: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi, Brett. I understand that you are the lucky person putting together the OP Commitment Notice to send EPA funds to DOE to support a potential DOE-NRC contract. The office I work in, OAR/OAP, is also contributing funds to this EPA-DOE IAA. Do you know what I need to do to get the funds from OAP onto the commitment notice you're compiling?

Margie Clayton, copied above, heads the Management and Operations group in OAP. Margie, I'll coordinate with you once we sort out what OP needs.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tue 5/19/2015 12:56:38 PM
Subject: ELG rule

Hi, Elizabeth,

Ex 5

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:27 PM
To: Barron, Alex
Cc: McGartland, Al; Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: FW: use of May 2015 estimates

Hi Alex,

Ex 5

What do you think?

(Matt will also flag this for you during your 4pm today.)

Thanks,
Elizabeth

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 5:36 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: Re: use of May 2015 estimates

thanks for flagging this.

Ex 5

Ex 5

we can flag this for our management and see what they think.

--

Alex Marten

marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 4:12 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: use of May 2015 estimates

Hi –

Ex 5 x 5

u
us

please let me know what you think and I can loop
in Allen on next steps.

Heavy Duty Phase 2

Ex 5

Ex 5

111(d)

Ex 5

111(b)

Ex 5

Landfills and Oil and Gas NSPS:

Ex 5

To: Kok, Nancy[Kok.Nancy@epa.gov]; Snyder, Brett[Snyder.Brett@epa.gov]
Cc: Clayton, Margie[Clayton.Margie@epa.gov]; Harvey, Alecia[Harvey.Alecia@epa.gov]; Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Palmer, Jamie[Palmer.Jamie@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tue 5/19/2015 12:30:35 PM
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Nancy. You are correct that it should have gone to the approvers first. Worked with our FCO this morning and sent it to the approvers for their review.

Thanks again,
Kate

-----Original Message-----

From: Kok, Nancy
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:39 PM
To: Shouse, Kate; Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kopits, Elizabeth; Palmer, Jamie
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate,

I see your CN in IGMS. It looks like it needs to be sent to your approvers first (Pamela Bullard and Margie Clayton) and then sent to your FCO (Jamie). Pamela and Margie have not approved it yet. Also in our office, we usually enter some information in the Fiscal Information table, e.g., FY, Approp Code, BO Code, etc., before we send it to our FCO. But your office may have a different business process.

Thanks,
Nancy Kok
Office of Policy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, 1805T
Washington, DC 20460
(202) 564-6064 (ph)
(202) 566-3001 (fax)
Kok.Nancy@epa.gov

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:15 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy; Kopits, Elizabeth; Palmer, Jamie
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Brett, that sounds like a good plan. I just sent the CN forward on my side so hopefully that will come through soon. I've listed you and Nancy as readers.

Jamie, I think it should go to you first in IGMS but please let me know if you don't receive it.

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:03 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate –

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks,

Brett
566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:13 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi, Brett. {

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks for sharing this information, it is immensely helpful.

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 9:50 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate:

Sounds like a plan.

Attaching working draft if the Statement of Work, should you want to include it anything it contains in communication with your management concerning project and Commitment Notice.

Here is some additional information we prepared in our Commitment Notice

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks again, and let us know if you have any questions.

Brett Snyder
USEPA, NCEE
202-566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 8:56 AM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Brett, for the helpful and prompt response. OAP can create the commitment notice in IGMS, route it, and finalize so that Leon can add the funds. I am going to meet with Margie on Monday morning so that we can sort through some OAP-specific details. In the meantime, if you are able to send a screen shot, that would be really helpful. Will circle back with you once we've created the commitment notice.

Thanks again,
Kate

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:38 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate and Margie:

Thank you for your notes and for helping us out with the IA with DOE to access their NRC contract.

Are you all able to create a Commitment Notice in the Interagency Agreement "Working" file in IGMS? If you are (hope so) that seems to me to be the best approach to take, since that way we can limit the review/approval/funds certifying officer roles on the Commitment Notice to the appropriate OAR staff. I fear if we try to combine both our funding actions into the same Commitment Notice, that will result in an unwieldy signature chain between OP and OAR.

The Commitment Notice can cite Alecia Harvey as the Project Officer; Nancy Kok (our OP grants expert) and me as "Readers" on the Commitment Notice; and Leon Smith as the grants specialist (he covers all DOE IAs). I can also send you a screen shot of our own work-in-progress Commitment Notice, along with some cut-n-paste narrative to include in a couple of the Commitment Notice fields.

One key missing bit of information we don't yet have is the official assigned IA# to be used by EPA. We have a temporary assigned ID#, but we'll need to add the official one to your Commitment Notice to help make sure it is properly tied to the Decision Memorandum. Expect to get one soon.

If instead of your office creating the Commitment Notice, you would rather we here in OP created one for you, that is OK too. If we do so, we need you to tell us all the names of the folks to include as OAR's approvers and FCO and the budget codes to use. We would fill in the rest of the form and then route it for you all to approve.

We have asked the legal counsel in the grants office to review our current Statement of Work for the IA, and are awaiting their final feedback. While there isn't a place on the Commitment Notice that requires this information, if you want to make reference anywhere in the record, their legal counsel indicated that the Clean Air Act §103(b)(2) is the appropriate statutory authority for this IA.

Thanks again, and if it helps to chat about anything as well, happy to do so.

Brett Snyder
USEPA, NCEE
202-566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:01 PM
To: Snyder, Brett

Cc: Clayton, Margie

Subject: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi, Brett. I understand that you are the lucky person putting together the OP Commitment Notice to send EPA funds to DOE to support a potential DOE-NRC contract. The office I work in, OAR/OAP, is also contributing funds to this EPA-DOE IAA. Do you know what I need to do to get the funds from OAP onto the commitment notice you're compiling?

Margie Clayton, copied above, heads the Management and Operations group in OAP. Margie, I'll coordinate with you once we sort out what OP needs.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Harvey, Alecia[Harvey.Alecia@epa.gov]; Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Kok, Nancy[Kok.Nancy@epa.gov]
From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Mon 5/18/2015 7:14:29 PM
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi – recommend we wait until we get confirmation from Elizabeth on the right set of numbers.

Ex 5

or

Ex 5

Thanks,

Brett

566-2261

From: Harvey, Alecia
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:08 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Ex 5

From: Snyder, Brett

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 3:03 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate – Ex 5
Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks,

Brett

566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 2:13 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi, Brett. Ex 5
Ex 5

Thanks for sharing this information, it is immensely helpful.

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 9:50 AM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate:

Sounds like a plan.

Attaching working draft if the Statement of Work, should you want to include it anything it contains in communication with your management concerning project and Commitment Notice.

Here is some additional information we prepared in our Commitment Notice

Ex 5

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks again, and let us know if you have any questions.

Brett Snyder

USEPA, NCEE

202-566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate

Sent: Friday, May 15, 2015 8:56 AM

To: Snyder, Brett

Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy

Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Thanks, Brett, for the helpful and prompt response. OAP can create the commitment notice in IGMS, route it, and finalize so that Leon can add the funds. I am going to meet with Margie on Monday morning so that we can sort through some OAP-specific details. In the meantime, if

you are able to send a screen shot, that would be really helpful. Will circle back with you once we've created the commitment notice.

Thanks again,
Kate

From: Snyder, Brett
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:38 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Cc: Clayton, Margie; Harvey, Alecia; Kok, Nancy
Subject: RE: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi Kate and Margie:

Thank you for your notes and for helping us out with the IA with DOE to access their NRC contract.

Are you all able to create a Commitment Notice in the Interagency Agreement "Working" file in IGMS? If you are (hope so) that seems to me to be the best approach to take, since that way we can limit the review/approval/funds certifying officer roles on the Commitment Notice to the appropriate OAR staff. I fear if we try to combine both our funding actions into the same Commitment Notice, that will result in an unwieldy signature chain between OP and OAR.

The Commitment Notice can cite Alecia Harvey as the Project Officer; Nancy Kok (our OP grants expert) and me as "Readers" on the Commitment Notice; and Leon Smith as the grants specialist (he covers all DOE IAs). I can also send you a screen shot of our own work-in-progress Commitment Notice, along with some cut-n-paste narrative to include in a couple of the Commitment Notice fields.

One key missing bit of information we don't yet have is the official assigned IA# to be used by EPA. We have a temporary assigned ID#, but we'll need to add the official one to your Commitment Notice to help make sure it is properly tied to the Decision Memorandum. Expect

to get one soon.

If instead of your office creating the Commitment Notice, you would rather we here in OP created one for you, that is OK too. If we do so, we need you to tell us all the names of the folks to include as OAR's approvers and FCO and the budget codes to use. We would fill in the rest of the form and then route it for you all to approve.

We have asked the legal counsel in the grants office to review our current Statement of Work for the IA, and are awaiting their final feedback. While there isn't a place on the Commitment Notice that requires this information, if you want to make reference anywhere in the record, their legal counsel indicated that the Clean Air Act §103(b)(2) is the appropriate statutory authority for this IA.

Thanks again, and if it helps to chat about anything as well, happy to do so.

Brett Snyder

USEPA, NCEE
202-566-2261

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2015 4:01 PM
To: Snyder, Brett
Cc: Clayton, Margie
Subject: Sending OAP funds to OP for a commitment notice

Hi, Brett. I understand that you are the lucky person putting together the OP Commitment Notice to send EPA funds to DOE to support a potential DOE-NRC contract. The office I work in, OAR/OAP, is also contributing funds to this EPA-DOE IAA. Do you know what I need to do to get the funds from OAP onto the commitment notice you're compiling?

Margie Clayton, copied above, heads the Management and Operations group in OAP. Margie, I'll coordinate with you once we sort out what OP needs.

Thanks,
Kate

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
From: Moore, Chris
Sent: Mon 5/18/2015 6:40:48 PM
Subject: Comments on the RIA
EO12866_LandfillsEG 2060 AS23 RIA 20150513_cm.docx

Hi Elizabeth,

Here are my comments on the RIA. There is one comment bubble with a question for you in the executive summary so please take a look at that.

They do monetize the climate benefits of the NSPS in the supplement to the RIA so I don't know why it wasn't in the other document. Feel free to nix any of my comments or edits if they are unwarranted.

Thanks,

Chris

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Mon 5/18/2015 5:28:33 PM
Subject: RE: ELG Docs
111(d) RIA ch4 benefits (05 18 15).docx

Yes, please see attached and let me know if you need anything else. Thanks!

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 1:24 PM
To: Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: ELG Docs

Kate – Can you send me the latest SCC discussion in the power plan rule? I just started to look at the discussion in the BCA below and I think it would benefit from an update. Alex suggested that the easiest thing would just be to send them the power plan discussion and tell them to insert that.

Thanks!

Elizabeth

From: Marten, Alex
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 11:15 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Shouse, Kate
Subject: FW: ELG Docs

I don't know why there are two documents...

--

Alex L. Marten

phone: (202) 566-2301
email: marten.alex@epa.gov

From: Walsh, Patrick
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2015 10:05 AM
To: Marten, Alex
Subject: ELG Docs

Enjoy!

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Sheriff, Glenn[Sheriff.Glenn@epa.gov]
From: Evans, DavidA
Sent: Wed 1/28/2015 11:12:15 PM
Subject: RE: Need materials to nominate Housing Policy Debate article

Hi Elizabeth,

Hopefully you aren't checking email, but if you are, I wanted to give you the heads up that we are preparing a nomination for this paper. We'll try to get the Record of Percentage Agreement stuff figured out when we can.

Let me know if you have any questions. Call me anytime (except, like, at 3am. Don't call me then. Please.)

Dave

From: Evans, DavidA
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:56 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Sheriff, Glenn
Subject: Re: Need materials to nominate Housing Policy Debate article

Well, my bad. I obviously got delayed

Ex 6 - Other

Ex 6 - Other but I still wish I would have thought before today about your constraints b/c I would have said something sooner. I'm sorry.

If you aren't inclined for us to nominate the paper, let me know. We definitely don't want to put you through pulling information together if you aren't so inclined. We know we will be nominating your SCC-related work, cost-retrospective work, etc. in the future.

d

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 7:03 PM
To: Evans, DavidA
Cc: Sheriff, Glenn
Subject: Re: Need materials to nominate Housing Policy Debate article

Ugh. I wish I had known about this earlier. Today was my last day in the office. I am planning to work a bit tomorrow from home. Will see what I can do.

Still feels weird to go through all this for a such a small paper.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2015, at 5:41 PM, "Evans, DavidA" <Evans.DavidA@epa.gov> wrote:

Elizabeth,

Sorry this didn't dawn on me until just now, but we need some information from you to prepare the STAA nomination materials for your Housing Policy Debate paper. Tentatively Glenn has volunteered to read the paper and draft up a description for the nomination form. The nominations are due Feb. 5, but importantly you are due sooner! (Materials regarding the STAA can be found here: http://epa.gov/ncer/staa/annual/2015/current_comp.html).

We need two items from you as soon as you can get them to us.

First, we need any information you have about ways in which this paper may have been referenced, discussed, etc. in EPA materials (if any). (We will use Google Scholar and other sources to find academic papers that have cited your work, but if you have any information

about how the work has been used elsewhere, that would be helpful, too.)

Second, we need what are called Record of Percentage Agreement forms. They break down the contribution of the authors by percentage so that, if a paper receives an award, the cash value to the EPA employee can be determined. So, for example, if you contributed 70% of the paper, and the paper receives an award at Level III, which is a max \$2K award, you would get \$1.4K. Note that your non-EPA coauthors get nothing, btw. Also, note that EPA employees must need to contribute at least 50% of the work on a paper for the paper to be eligible for nomination.

“Record of Percentage Agreement: The nomination package must include a Record of Percentage Agreement document from each author listed on the nomination form. This document may be submitted in the form of an e-mail or signed letter, which states that the co-author agrees with the total percentage of effort listed beside his or her name on the nomination form, and included as the last information provided in the nomination package. **The document should list “Record of Percentage Agreement” in the subject line, followed by the co-author’s first and last name. The body of the document should contain the co-author’s name, organization, and contact information, the nominee’s name, the title(s) of the nominated publication(s), and a brief paragraph stating that the author is in agreement with his or her designated percentage of contribution.**“

I’ve attached an example from a previous nomination. Note that both you and all of your coauthors need to provide one (or, if you can’t track down a coauthor, you have to document that.)

I’m around tomorrow if you have any questions,

Dave

<Record of Percentage Agreement (David Scrogin).pdf>

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
From: Linn, Joshua
Sent: Wed 1/21/2015 10:47:29 PM
Subject: RE: follow up on SCC

Elizabeth,

We are still targeting an early February meeting with the interagency group. Maury and Howard are trying to get in touch—I will follow up with Maury when we meet tomorrow to see if we can start scheduling. Jim Stock's email is very helpful because I have the subgroup rosters but not the whole list. And thanks for the DOI suggestion.

Ex 5

Thank you in advance for feedback on the response to comments. I have read through the first few pages of Jim's draft, but I will wait until you send your comments before I keep going.

And, most importantly, good luck!

Ex 6 - Other

Josh

From: Kopits, Elizabeth [mailto:Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 12:01 PM
To: Linn, Joshua
Cc: Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: follow up on SCC

To: Kopits, Elizabeth[Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Cc: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
From: Linn, Joshua
Sent: Wed 1/21/2015 10:47:29 PM
Subject: RE: follow up on SCC

Elizabeth,

We are still targeting an early February meeting with the interagency group. Maury and Howard are trying to get in touch—I will follow up with Maury when we meet tomorrow to see if we can start scheduling. Jim Stock's email is very helpful because I have the subgroup rosters but not the whole list. And thanks for the DOI suggestion.

Ex 5

Thank you in advance for feedback on the response to comments. I have read through the first few pages of Jim's draft, but I will wait until you send your comments before I keep going.

Ex 6 - Other

Josh

From: Kopits, Elizabeth [mailto:Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 12:01 PM
To: Linn, Joshua
Cc: Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: follow up on SCC

Hi Josh,

Non-Responsive

I just wanted to touch base with you on SCC and see if there is anything we can do to help on some logistical next steps.

Ex 5

As for the draft RTC, we are aiming to get you and Jim our initial staff level reactions on the first half as soon as possible – hopefully by the end of the week.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

SCC Comment Process - Subgroup Participants:

Ex 5

Hi Josh,

Non-Responsive

I just wanted to touch base with you on SCC and see if there is anything we can do to help on some logistical next steps.

Ex 5

As for the draft RTC, we are aiming to get you and Jim our initial staff level reactions on the first half as soon as possible – hopefully by the end of the week.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

SCC Comment Process - Subgroup Participants:

Ex 5

From: Stock, Jim [mailto:[EOP email/phone](#)]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 10:45 AM
To: Stock, Jim; Mancini, Dominic J.; Laity, Jim; Duke, Rick; Shelanski, Howard; Bruce_D_Rodan [mailto:[EOP email/phone](#)]; Holdren, John P.; Utech, Dan G.; McConville, Drew; 'mcgartland.al@epa.gov'; 'barron.alex@epa.gov'; 'gunning.paul@epa.gov'; 'shouse.kate@epa.gov'; 'kopits.elizabeth@epa.gov'; 'bryan.mignone@hq.doe.gov'; 'Elke.Hodson@Hq.Doe.Gov'; 'shelper@doc.gov'; 'PFeather@oce.usda.gov'; 'William.Hohenstein@usda.gov'; 'RJohansson@oce.usda.gov'; 'arthur.rypinski@dot.gov'; 'james_anderson@ios.doi.gov'; 'aevia@blm.gov'; Lawrence, Natasha; Newbold, Steve; Griffiths, Charles; Simon, Bob; Marten, Alex; Dickinson, Tammy; Jencks, Fae; Thomas, Amanda I.; Wolverton, Ann; Schwab, Margo; Higgins, Cortney; Herman, Andrea (Intern); jonathan.pershing@hq.doe.gov
Cc: Shadbegian, Ron
Subject: IWG Response to SCC Comments - process

Dear SCC Interagency Group Members,

OMB and EPA reviewed the SCC public comments and EPA summarized them in their briefing of the interagency work group (IWG) on May 5th (handout attached). At Monday's meeting, it was agreed to set up three IWG sub-groups to help OMB respond to the public comments. The three sub-groups and a brief summary of their scope are:

Ex 5

From: Stock, Jim [mailto:[EOP email/phone](#)]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 10:45 AM
To: Stock, Jim; Mancini, Dominic J.; Laity, Jim; Duke, Rick; Shelanski, Howard; Bruce_D_Rodan [mailto:[EOP email/phone](#)]; Holdren, John P.; Utech, Dan G.; McConville, Drew; 'mcgartland.al@epa.gov'; 'barron.alex@epa.gov'; 'gunning.paul@epa.gov'; 'shouse.kate@epa.gov'; 'kopits.elizabeth@epa.gov'; 'bryan.mignone@hq.doe.gov'; 'Elke.Hodson@Hq.Doe.Gov'; 'shelper@doc.gov'; 'PFeather@oce.usda.gov'; 'William.Hohenstein@usda.gov'; 'RJohansson@oce.usda.gov'; 'arthur.rypinski@dot.gov'; 'james_anderson@ios.doi.gov'; 'aevia@blm.gov'; Lawrence, Natasha; Newbold, Steve; Griffiths, Charles; Simon, Bob; Marten, Alex; Dickinson, Tammy; Jencks, Fae; Thomas, Amanda I.; Wolverton, Ann; Schwab, Margo; Higgins, Cortney; Herman, Andrea (Intern); jonathan.pershing@hq.doe.gov
Cc: Shadbegian, Ron
Subject: IWG Response to SCC Comments - process

Dear SCC Interagency Group Members,

OMB and EPA reviewed the SCC public comments and EPA summarized them in their briefing of the interagency work group (IWG) on May 5th (handout attached). At Monday's meeting, it was agreed to set up three IWG sub-groups to help OMB respond to the public comments. The three sub-groups and a brief summary of their scope are:

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks for your help – and thanks to EPA and OMB for the great job pulling together the summary of the comments.

Jim Stock

CEA

Ex 5

Thanks for your help – and thanks to EPA and OMB for the great job pulling together the summary of the comments.

Jim Stock

CEA

To: Stenhouse, Jeb[Stenhouse.Jeb@epa.gov]
Cc: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Macpherson, Alex[Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Fawcett, Allen[Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Mon 7/20/2015 2:13:39 PM
Subject: Re: Still need decision on short vs metric

I think an explanatory footnote on all tables showing SCC in \$/short ton would be helpful.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 10:11 AM, "Stenhouse, Jeb" <Stenhouse.Jeb@epa.gov> wrote:

I think a limited, one-time presentation of the SCC value if presented in short tons is an issue of math, [REDACTED]

Ex 5

Ex 5

Ex 5

[REDACTED] you could even include language in the footnote explaining that this represents no change in what the SCC represents or how it was derived).

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 10:07 AM
To: Stenhouse, Jeb; Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex; Fawcett, Allen
Subject: RE: Still need decision on short vs metric

Hi, Jeb. +Elizabeth Kopits and Alex Marten, who work on SCC, and Allen. The concern with showing SCC as \$/short tons is that we're adding yet another change to the SCC estimates. We've never presented them as \$/short ton before, so it creates a consistency issue in the SCC world and also raises the likelihood of errors in our reporting of the SC-CO2 (cited throughout the preamble and RIA, in various table notes and text). We also recently published corrections to the SCC estimates so there is an optics issue too (continual changes to the estimates).

Ex 5

From: Stenhouse, Jeb
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 6:00 AM
To: Shouse, Kate; Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Adamantiades, Mikhail; Weatherhead, Darryl; Eschmann, Erich; Alsalam, Jameel
Subject: RE: Still need decision on short vs metric

Kate – I need to understand why the SCC cannot itself be presented in \$/short-ton. For better or worse, people will be making comparisons between the cost-effectiveness of BB measures in the rule, which will be presented in \$/short-ton, with the SCC, which you seem

Ex 5

So I think we need to understand what the problem is here, even if we stick with the structure you just proposed.

Jeb

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 3:21 PM
To: Macpherson, Alex
Cc: Stenhouse, Jeb; Adamantiades, Mikhail; Weatherhead, Darryl; Eschmann, Erich; Alsalam, Jameel
Subject: Re: Still need decision on short vs metric

Thx, Alex, and that's correct. We would present the estimated benefits as follows: short tons (units= short tons reduced in a year), the equivalent amt in metric tons (metric tons/specific year), and the estimated benefit (\$ in that year for those reductions). The tables with SCC remain the same (\$ per metric ton); that cannot be changed to \$/short ton. The rulemaking's climate benefits are presented in dollars for a given year and do not change regardless of whether we're showing metric or imperial tons. We've already made that adjustment.

Thx

Sent from my iPhone

To: Miller, Chris J -FS[chrismler@fs.fed.us]
Cc: Schaefer, Julie -FS[jschaefer@fs.fed.us]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Wed 7/15/2015 7:37:39 PM
Subject: RE: Social Cost of Carbon Uncertainty/Reliability
SCC 2013 TSD output - July 2015 revision.zip

Hi Chris,

Per our conversation, attached here is the raw output from the July 2015 SCC runs. Please let me know if you have any trouble with the file. As I mentioned on the phone if you want to calculate the 5th or other percentile (from say the 3% runs) for each year between 2016-2050, then the way to do it that would be consistent with what we did for the 95th, is to first calculate the overall 5th (from the 3% runs) for 2010, 2020, 2030, 2040, and 2050, and then linearly interpolate between these years.

The current version of the SCC TSD and other announcements related to SCC can be found at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/oira/social-cost-of-carbon> .

Will get back to you regarding the third question, but as I started saying on the phone, I don't think you need to Ex 5

Talk to you again soon.

Regards,

Elizabeth

From: Miller, Chris J -FS [mailto:chrismler@fs.fed.us]
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 7:46 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Schaefer, Julie -FS
Subject: RE: Social Cost of Carbon Uncertainty/Reliability

Hi Elizabeth,

Thanks very much for the reply (I was on travel and didn't get a chance to respond to you).

I would indeed like to get access to the full SCC output from all the runs and we can do some 'rank and percentile' calculations. I guess I'm still unclear if we would need the data for all the years to calculate year-specific percentile values? We are currently looking at an analysis period of 2016 to 2051.

It looks like changes in the revised SCC values are relatively small. Would you know if the revised TSD is going to be available soon so we can reference the new values? Or perhaps we simply rely on the existing 2013 TSD values.

Regarding the third question – the context is that

Ex 5

Ex 5

Ex 5

Ex 5

Chris

From: Kopits, Elizabeth [<mailto:Kopits.Elizabeth@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 1:01 PM
To: Miller, Chris J -FS; Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; Marten, Alex
Subject: RE: Social Cost of Carbon Uncertainty/Reliability

Hi Chris,

I know Charles is swamped today so here are a few quick reactions to your questions below.

1. You are correct that it is inappropriate to take the average of the 5th or 95th percentiles in Appendix A to estimate the aggregate 5th/95th across all runs. We are happy to send you the full SCC output from all runs if you would like and you can do the calculation. Just let me know what years you are interested in.
2. Yes, we are aware of last week's minor technical revision to the TSD. The July 2nd OMB blog post (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/blog>) provides a link to it, as well as a link to the response to comments received through the recent OMB comment solicitation.
3. As for your third question, perhaps it would be easiest to talk through this by phone so we can be sure we understand the context correctly. Perhaps sometime later this week? Let me know when might work for you.

Hope this helps for now!

Regards,

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Kopits, Ph.D.

National Center for Environmental Economics

Office of Policy, US EPA

1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, MC 1809T

Washington, DC 20460

(202) 566-2299

From: Miller, Chris J -FS [<mailto:chrismiller@fs.fed.us>]

Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 8:53 PM

To: Griffiths, Charles; Newbold, Steve; Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex

Subject: RE: Social Cost of Carbon Uncertainty/Reliability

Hi Charles,

As follow-up to our phone call about application of SCC values to Forest Service project-level decisions in May, we have a couple questions that you may be able to help us with.

Regarding uncertainty, you referred us to Appendix A of the 2013 updated Technical support document where there are tables of 5th as well as 95th percentile estimates of SCC values by model and scenario. However, there are not percentile values for the aggregate distribution of all 150,000 simulations across all models and scenarios (i.e., there is no aggregate line in Appendix A tables). I don't believe its appropriate to take the average of the 5th or 95th percentile

values in Appendix A to estimate an aggregate 5th/95th percentile SCC values across all models/scenarios. We are also seeking percentile values for years other than 2020.

Our Washington office informed us of recent news showing that SCC values have been revised in response to public comment – so we were also wondering if you are aware of any official revision of SCC values (or is the 2013 still appropriate for current analyses).

We have also run into another tangential

Ex 5

Ex 5

Thanks again for any suggestions or direction you folks might have,

Chris

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Wed 7/15/2015 1:23:23 PM
Subject: RE: SCC sentence

I am fine with your change. Thanks.

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 9:13 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Subject: SCC sentence

Ex 5

Ex 5

I changed it to:

Ex 5

[1] The full models names are as follows: Dynamic Integrated Climate and Economy (DICE); Climate Framework for Uncertainty, Negotiation, and Distribution (FUND); and Policy Analysis of the Greenhouse Gas Effect (PAGE).

[2] The full models names are as follows: Dynamic Integrated Climate and Economy (DICE); Climate Framework

for Uncertainty, Negotiation, and Distribution (FUND); and Policy Analysis of the Greenhouse Gas Effect (PAGE).

To: Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tue 6/30/2015 1:35:05 PM
Subject: Fw: SCC Response to Comments

Ex 5

From: Silverman, Steven
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:28 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: SCC Response to Comments

Thanks. The response on **Ex 5** is reasonable.

Ex 5

-----Original Message-----

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:20 AM
To: Silverman, Steven; Shouse, Kate; Roberts, Martha
Cc: Marten, Alex; McGartland, Al
Subject: Re: SCC Response to Comments

Hi Steve,

There is a response about **Ex 5** Does that help? Please let me know if you find any concerns in that part.

Thanks,
Elizabeth

From: Silverman, Steven
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:16 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Shouse, Kate; Roberts, Martha
Cc: Marten, Alex; McGartland, Al
Subject: RE: SCC Response to Comments

Was this comment responded to? May I see the response if so?

Ex 5

-----Original Message-----

From: Kopits, Elizabeth

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:11 AM

To: Shouse, Kate; Silverman, Steven; Roberts, Martha

Cc: Marten, Alex; McGartland, Al

Subject: Fw: SCC Response to Comments

Hi All -

Here's what I just sent back to Jim. Thank you again for taking the time to help on this yesterday! We really appreciate it. I will loop you in on any follow up questions/reactions from DOE/DOJ today.

Thanks,
Elizabeth

From: Kopits, Elizabeth

Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2015 9:06 AM

To: Laity, Jim

Cc: Marten, Alex; McGartland, Al

Subject: Re: SCC Response to Comments

Hi Jim,

Attached is our suggested response -- see p. 8. I also changed June to July in the document (3 instances). I hope this helps. Please let us know if you would like to discuss or if we can be of any further help.

Thanks!
Elizabeth

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; Sarofim, Marcus[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov]
Cc: Fulcher, Charles[Fulcher.Charles@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Mon 7/13/2015 12:59:04 PM
Subject: RE: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)

Thanks, Kate. Looping in Alex M too since he will be interested in the answer to Marcus' question re: **Non-Responsive**

As for your question on what more to add to docket on Sarofim et al., my feeling is that a copy of the forthcoming paper should be sufficient for purposes of the Landfill and O&G proposals, but happy to discuss once you have had a chance to look at the latest version of the RIA insert.

Thanks!
Elizabeth

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 4:25 PM
To: Sarofim, Marcus
Cc: Fulcher, Charles; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)

+ **Elizabeth** (no action needed but we'll likely need to talk Monday about **Non-Responsive** see below).

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

From: Sarofim, Marcus

Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 2:59 PM

To: Shouse, Kate

Subject: RE: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Pages 33-35 are a summary of the 2009 Endangerment Finding (which itself summarizes the assessment literature), and therefore inserting citations in the middle of the summary would not be appropriate. The statements from pages 35-50 reference in text the assessments (NCA3, NRC, or IPCC) from which they were taken.

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Sounds like Alex & Elizabeth are on top of this one, but I'm happy to help. The difference

Non-Responsive

fill

Also, on page 4-15 of the RIA, perhaps we could add Sarofim et al. 2015 to the reference list in the following sentence: “Reducing methane emissions, therefore, can reduce global background ozone concentrations, human exposure to ozone, and the incidence of ozone-related health effects (West et al., 2006, Anenberg et al., 2009).”

(Sarofim et al., Environmental and Resource Economics, 2015. DOI: [10.1007/s10640-015-9937-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-015-9937-6))

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
WJC East 4410M
Environmental Scientist
Climate Science & Impacts Branch

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 10:55 AM
To: Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: FW: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)
Importance: High

Hi, Marcus. We received OMB comments on landfills and looks like they have some comments on the climate science sections. The Word document lists OMB comments (those in yellow are for OAP, see below for explanation); the attached email includes the documents we sent to OMB.

Haven't read through in detail, just wanted to send along now given tight timeline. Thanks!

From Hillary's msg:

Everyone should use the OMB version of the package to track in edits. Please keep me

posted on status, as comments will need to be turned around quickly.

1st target: 2pm today: Let me know if a call is needed to discuss comments with OMB.

2nd target: COB Monday: resolution of outstanding comments

From: Ward, Hillary

Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 10:03 AM

To: Fulcher, Charles; Marsh, Karen; Kopits, Elizabeth; Shouse, Kate; Marsh, Karen; Ganguli, Swarupa; Cappel, Kirsten; Vetter, Rick

Cc: Cozzie, David

Subject: FW: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)

Importance: High

Hi everyone,

We are still working toward signature on  Please see the attached comments. I have modified as follows:

Highlights (assignments)

Teal: OAP-LMOP

Yellow: OP-econ, HEID, OAP-CCD (including entire separate RIA comment section)

Green: HEID

RED: OAP-LMOP and SPPD

Gray: OP-econ, HEID, OAQPS

Pink OGC. Note last comment

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

No highlight: SPPD

Everyone should use the OMB version of the package to track in edits. Please keep me posted on status, as comments will need to be turned around quickly.

1st target: 2pm today: Let me know if a call is needed to discuss comments with OMB.

2nd target: COB Monday: resolution of outstanding comments

Hillary Ward

US EPA, Sector Policies and Programs Division

Fuels and Incineration Group

(919)541-3154

From: Thundiyil, Karen

Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 9:34 AM

To: Ward, Hillary; Marsh, Karen; Cozzie, David

Subject: FW: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)

I'll fill you in on the latest with OMB on timing later this morning when I have more details.

From: Grossman, Andrea [[mailto:](#)]

EOP email/phone

Sent: Thursday, July 09, 2015 5:34 PM

To: Thundiyil, Karen

Cc: Szabo, Aaron; Laity, Jim

Subject: Summary of Interagency Comments under EO 12866 and 13563 for EPA's MSW Landfill Rules (RINs 2060-AM08 and 2060-AS23)

Attached please find a summary of interagency comments under EOs 12866 and 13563 on the EPA supplemental proposal and proposed rule, titles "Standards of Performance for Municipal Solid Waste Landfills" and "Emissions Guidelines and Compliance Times for Municipal Solid

Waste Landfills”, as well as the accompanying RIA covering both.

These compiled comments are being sent at this point in light of ongoing discussions about this rule’s schedule. Additional interagency comments will be sent as they become available.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Andrea Grossman
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
EOP email/phone

To: Cozzie, David[Cozzie.David@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Fri 7/10/2015 4:18:53 PM
Subject: Fw: Landfills - one more tweak to the RIA
2015 06 18 EO12866 LandfillsEG 2060 AS23 RIA 20150609_ek alm.docx

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2015 11:34 AM
To: Ward, Hillary; Marsh, Karen
Cc: Marten, Alex; Thundiyil, Karen; Cozzie, David; Adams, Darryl; Barron, Alex; McGartland, Al; Sarofim, Marcus
Subject: Landfills - one more tweak to the RIA

Hi Hillary, Karen, et al.,

So sorry to do this, but I realized after the call that I misspoke when answering Jim's CO2 question (I was thinking of Oil&Gas!).

Ex 5

Ex 5

I think the only other outstanding issue is **Non-Responsive** going forward, but I think Al or Alex B will be following up on that on a separate track.

Thanks, and sorry again!

Elizabeth

To: Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]; DeLuca, Isabel[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tue 7/7/2015 2:35:15 PM
Subject: RE: social cost of methane Q&As
2015 07 01 Desk statement and QA on use of Marten et al 2014 in RIAs REFLECTS LANDFILLS
RIA.docx

None from me either. Also, in case you need it already, here is the version that reflects use of the methodology in the Landfills RIA. (Landfills and O&G will be the first rules to use it in the main BCA, so the desk statement and Q&A are slightly different here to reflect that.)

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions/concerns.

Thanks!

Elizabeth

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:47 AM
To: DeLuca, Isabel; Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: social cost of methane Q&As

No concerns from me, thanks, Isabel.

From: DeLuca, Isabel
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:33 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: social cost of methane Q&As

Ex 5

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:21 AM
To: Shouse, Kate; DeLuca, Isabel
Subject: RE: social cost of methane Q&As

Hi Isabel and Kate,

Please use this version instead. It reflects the use of the estimates in RIAs released to date (i.e., in HD2 sensitivity analysis only). This is the version I sent to OCIR late last week. Once landfills or O&G are released, we can provide you with an updated desk statement and Q&A.

Thanks!

Elizabeth

From: Shouse, Kate
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:15 AM
To: DeLuca, Isabel
Cc: Kopits, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: social cost of methane Q&As

Hi, Isabel. I've attached the latest desk statement on social cost of methane, which includes Q&As. I've copied Elizabeth Kopits to make sure she doesn't have any further updates. Elizabeth, I took the 6/15/15 draft and updated the NRC nomenclature and added the links to SCC TSD/Academies announcement (redline). If you have any further changes, please let us know.

Isabel, did OAQPS communications ask for these talking points or was it regulatory staff seeking Q&As for internal purposes? I've had to reschedule the briefing but am talking to David Cozzie at noon.

Thanks!

Kate

From: DeLuca, Isabel
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 5:33 PM
To: Shouse, Kate
Subject: social cost of methane Q&As

Hi Kate,

I know you're briefing OAQPS on the social cost of methane tomorrow. They've asked whether or not we have any canned Q&As prepared on the topic yet. I'll have to dig to see what I have, but thought I'd also punt to you in case you have something handy that is in shape to share.

Thanks,
Isabel

Isabel DeLuca

Climate Change Division, US EPA

(202) 343-9247

To: Friedman, Kristina[Friedman.Kristina@epa.gov]
Cc: Roberts, Martha[Roberts.Martha@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov];
McGartland, Al[McGartland.Al@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Mon 7/6/2015 6:49:56 PM
Subject: RE: draft hearing prep on SCC

These edits look great to me. Thanks! Feel free to send them forward for her book.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Friedman, Kristina
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 2:46 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: Roberts, Martha; Shouse, Kate; McGartland, Al
Subject: RE: draft hearing prep on SCC

Hi Elizabeth,

Thanks for sharing these draft materials. You'll see that I modified the format of the key messages, but I didn't make any substantive changes. While we probably could cut back these questions, I'm not sure if it is necessary at this point. However, if folks would like to cut them down, I'm happy to take a first cut. If you're ok with these slight revisions, I can send forward for her book, unless you're already planning to do so.

Thanks,

Kristina

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 1:55 PM
To: Friedman, Kristina

Cc: Roberts, Martha; Shouse, Kate; McGartland, Al
Subject: draft hearing prep on SCC

Hi Kristina,

Per our conversation, here is the draft SCC materials for the hearing prep. As we discussed, I know it is too long, so feel free to suggest parts we can drop, or otherwise edit as you see fit. I'm happy to take another look or discuss after that if helpful.

Thanks!

Elizabeth

To: Roberts, Martha[Roberts.Martha@epa.gov]; McGartland, Al[McGartland.Al@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Mon 7/6/2015 5:27:36 PM
Subject: RE: Hearing Prep

Hi Martha,

Not sure how much Kristina usually reviews these things but feel free to send it to her if you would like. Usually it is just Kate and I who work on them and keep each other in the loop.

As for the blog post, I added a couple of topline points and Q&As referring to the response to comments, revised numbers, and upcoming NAS review but tried to keep it short. I did not specifically say anything about a “blog post”, just that OMB released a response to comments, etc., but it would be easy to tweak if we need that level of detail re: how the information was announced. Let me know what you think is best. I am also happy to just call Kristina and discuss with her if that would be helpful.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Roberts, Martha
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 1:18 PM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; McGartland, Al; Marten, Alex
Subject: FW: Hearing Prep

Elizabeth, thanks so much for pulling together the SCC TPs, which apparently I am wrongly getting all the credit for.

Please see Kristina Friedman’s email below. Do your materials cover this OMB blog post? If not, should I ask Kristina to draft something up that we could add to your materials? Meanwhile, would it be helpful/appropriate to loop Kristina in and have her review your materials since Kate is out? Not sure how involved she has been in your efforts.

Thanks again,

Martha

From: Friedman, Kristina
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 1:00 PM
To: Roberts, Martha
Cc: Gunning, Paul
Subject: Hearing Prep

Hi Martha,

We just finished the OAR hearing prep session with the Administrator and briefly mentioned the OMB's latest blog on the SCC. We were informed that you were putting together some materials for the Administrator's hearing prep and wanted to reach out to make sure you had what you needed on SCC. Feel free to reach out if you need anything.

Thanks,

Kristina

Kristina Friedman

Office of Atmospheric Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 343-9281

To: Roberts, Martha[Roberts.Martha@epa.gov]
Cc: McGartland, Al[McGartland.Al@epa.gov]; Marten, Alex[Marten.Alex@epa.gov]; Shouse, Kate[Shouse.Kate@epa.gov]
From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Mon 7/6/2015 4:32:34 PM
Subject: updated SCC TPs and Q&A for 7/9 hearing
[SCC hearing materials \(07 06 15\).docx](#)

Hi Martha,

Here are some updated SCC TPs and Q&A, which reflect last week's OMB blog post etc. Kate is out today so she has not had a chance to weigh in, but I imagine we need to get these to OCIR asap so feel free to send forward (unless you have comments/edits first), or let me know who I should send it to.

Thanks!

Elizabeth

From: Roberts, Martha
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 9:19 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth
Cc: McGartland, Al; Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: RE: SCC

Sounds like they still need them. Thank you!

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 8:51 AM
To: Roberts, Martha
Cc: McGartland, Al; Marten, Alex; Shouse, Kate
Subject: FW: SCC

Hi Martha,

Do you know if OCIR still needs SCC Q&A for the Administrator's upcoming testimony before HST on "regulatory efforts" on 7/9? Alex B asked for this a while back (see email chain below) but I'm afraid I didn't get to close the loop on it. Perhaps you know what he ended up sending along, if anything, before he left?

Let me know when you can, or let me know who I should reach out to in OCIR to inquire about this if that is easier. I can easily send something along within the next few hours if need be.

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Kopits, Elizabeth
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2015 1:55 PM
To: Barron, Alex; Marten, Alex
Cc: McGartland, Al; Roberts, Martha
Subject: RE: SCC

Hi Alex,

I am working on the SCC materials, but given that I will still have to run it by Kate, and you will likely want to shorten/tweak too (we have so many Q&A at this point it's hard to know how many to include), it's unlikely that a final version will be ready for her book by COB today.

Any chance you can you get us a little extension?

Thanks,

Elizabeth

From: Wolverton, Ann
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2015 9:33 AM
To: Barron, Alex; Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Cc: McGartland, Al; Roberts, Martha
Subject: RE: SCC

Hi Alex,

Attached are some bullets on the e Non-Responsive They are consistent with what we say in the desk statement. Let me know if you need anything else.

Ann

From: Barron, Alex
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 11:03 AM
To: Kopits, Elizabeth; Marten, Alex
Cc: Wolverton, Ann; McGartland, Al; Roberts, Martha
Subject: FW: SCC

The Administrator is testifying before HST on “regulatory efforts” on 7/9 but OCIR would like some materials for her book by COB this Thursday.

Can we pull together updated materials for the Administrator on SCC on that timeline? I think

Ex 5

I think we want a short set of bullets on SCM, in case that comes up, reflecting what we did in HDV etc.

Ann – Can you produce some bullets in case she gets asked a question about?

Non-Responsive

Non-Responsive

Al/Martha – Please chime in if you can think of other topics likely to come up.

Alex